arXiv:hep-ph/0506099v1 10 Jun 2005

IFT–05/13

The simplest 3+2 model with two light sterile neutrinos

Wojciech Królikowski

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Warsaw University
Hoża 69, PL–00–681 Warszawa, Poland

Abstract

The simplest 3+2 neutrino model is described, where two light sterile neutrinos mix very weakly with three active neutrinos and mutually do not mix at all, while the mass-squared scale of the possible LSND effect is provided by $m_5^2 - m_4^2$ (ν_4 and ν_5 being two additional mass neutrinos connected with the existence of two sterile neutrinos ν_s and $\nu_{s'}$). This 3+2 model is not better for explaining the LSND effect than the simplest 3+1 neutrino model, where one light sterile neutrino mixes very weakly with three active neutrinos, while the mass-squared scale of the possible LSND effect is given by $m_4^2 - m_1^2$ (ν_4 denoting an additional mass neutrino existing due to a sterile neutrino ν_s). However, a small LSND effect with amplitude of the order $\mathrm{O}(10^{-3})$ is not excluded by the present (pre-MiniBooNE) data.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff , 14.60.Pq , 12.15.Hh .

June 2005

As is well known, the neutrino mixing matrix $U^{(3)} = \left(U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}\right)$ ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$) appearing in the unitary transformation

$$\nu_\alpha = \sum_i U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}\, \nu_i \tag{1}$$

between the flavor neutrinos $\nu_e\,,\, \nu_\mu\,,\, \nu_\tau$ and mass neutrinos ν_1, ν_2, ν_3 is experimentally consistent with the global bilarge form

$$U^{(3)} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{array} \right) \,, \tag{2}$$

where $s^2_{12} \sim 0.30$ [1], while $U^{(3)}_{e3} = s_{13} \exp(-i\delta)$ is negligible according to the negative result of Chooz experiment [2] (the upper limit is $s^2_{13} < 0.03$). When neglecting s_{13}, the neutrino oscillation probabilities (in the vacuum) are

$$P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) = \delta_{\beta\alpha} - 4 \sum_{j>i} U^{(3)}_{\beta j} U^{(3)}_{\alpha j}\, U^{(3)}_{\beta i} U^{(3)}_{\alpha i} \sin^2 x_{ji}\,, \tag{3}$$

where

$$x_{ji} \equiv 1.27 \frac{\Delta m^2_{ji} L}{E}\;,\; \Delta m^2_{ji} \equiv m^2_j - m^2_i \tag{4}$$

(Δm^2_{ji}, L and E are measured in eV^2, km and GeV, respectively), giving experimentally $\Delta m^2_{21} \sim 8.0 \times 10^{-5}\mathrm{eV}^2$ as well as $|\Delta m^2_{32}| \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-3}\mathrm{eV}^2$ [1] for solar ν_e's and KamLAND reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$'s (with the solar MSW effect included) as well as atmospheric and K2K accelerator ν_μ's, respectively.

The formulae (2) and (3) are consistent with the zero LSND effect. The nonzero LSND effect [3] would require the existence of a third neutrino mass-squared splitting, absent in the case of three active neutrinos only (unless the CPT invariance of neutrino oscillations is seriously violated, what does not seem to be realistic). The LSND effect will be tested soon in the ongoing MiniBooNE experiment [4]. If this test confirms the LSND effect, we will need at least one light sterile neutrino in addition to three active neutrinos in order to introduce one extra mass-squared splitting (but – at the same time – not to change significantly the fit to solar, reactor, atmospheric and accelerator neutrino experiments).

While the 3+1 neutrino models with one light sterile neutrino are considered to be disfavored by present data [5], the 3+2 neutrino schemes with two light sterile neutrinos may provide a better description of current neutrino oscillations including the LSND effect [6]. However, the special 3+2 model of Ref. [7], where among three active neutrinos ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ and two sterile neutrinos $\nu_s, \nu_{s'}$ there are two maximally mixing pairs ν_μ, ν_τ and $\nu_s, \nu_{s'}$, does not meet these expectations. Also, the simplest 3+2 neutrino model considered in the present note is not better for explaining the LSND effect than the simplest 3+1 neutrino model [8].

For the experimental existence of two light sterile neutrinos (beside three generations of SM-active leptons and quarks) we argued some time ago in Refs. [9], where a Pauli principle working intrinsically within a generalized Dirac equation was introduced. In our simplest 3+2 neutrino model considered here, two light sterile neutrinos $\nu_s, \nu_{s'}$ mix very weakly with three active neutrinos ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ and mutually do not mix at all.

The simplest 3+2 neutrino model is defined by the 5×5 mixing matrix $U^{(5)} = \left(U^{(5)}_{\alpha i}\right)$ $(\alpha = e, \mu, \tau, s, s'$ and $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(5)} &= U^{(5)}(12) U^{(5)}(14, 25) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} c_{14} & s_{12} c_{25} & 0 & c_{12} s_{14} & s_{12} s_{25} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} c_{14} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} c_{25} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} s_{14} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} s_{25} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} c_{14} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} c_{25} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} s_{14} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} s_{25} \\ -s_{14} & 0 & 0 & c_{14} & 0 \\ 0 & -s_{25} & 0 & 0 & c_{25} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(5)}(12) &= \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} s_{12} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_{12} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ U^{(5)}(14, 25) &= \begin{pmatrix} c_{14} & 0 & 0 & s_{14} & 0 \\ 0 & c_{25} & 0 & 0 & s_{25} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -s_{14} & 0 & 0 & c_{14} & 0 \\ 0 & -s_{25} & 0 & 0 & c_{25} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In this model, the extended unitary transformation (1) holds between the flavor neutrinos $\nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau, \nu_s, \nu_{s'}$ and mass neutrinos $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4, \nu_5$, where $U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}$ are replaced by $U^{(5)}_{\alpha i}$. Here,

$c^2_{14} \gg s^2_{14}$ and $c^2_{25} \gg s^2_{25}$ guarantee the very weak mixing of two sterile neutrinos $\nu_s, \nu_{s'}$ with three active neutrinos ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ. Besides, there is no mixing between ν_s and $\nu_{s'}$.

Then, making use of the extended neutrino oscillation formulae (3), where $U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}$ are replaced by $U^{(5)}_{\alpha i}$, we obtain (in the vacuum)

$$P(\nu_e \to \nu_e) \simeq 1-4c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\left(1-s^2_{14}-s^2_{25}\right)\sin^2 x_{21}-4c^2_{12}s^2_{14}\sin^2 x_{41}-4s^2_{12}s^2_{25}\sin^2 x_{51} \tag{7}$$

when $x_{41} \simeq x_{42}$, $x_{51} \simeq x_{52}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu) &\simeq 1 - c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\left(1 - s^2_{14} - s^2_{25}\right)\sin^2 x_{21} - \left(1 - s^2_{12}s^2_{14} - c^2_{12}s^2_{25}\right)\sin^2 x_{32} \\ &\quad -2s^2_{12}s^2_{14}\sin^2 x_{41} - 2c^2_{12}s^2_{25}\sin^2 x_{51} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

when $x_{31} \simeq x_{32}$, $x_{41} \simeq x_{42}$, $x_{51} \simeq x_{52}$, as well as

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar\nu_\mu \to \bar\nu_e) &\simeq 2c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\left(1 - s^2_{14} - s^2_{25}\right)\sin^2 x_{21} + 2c^2_{12}s^2_{12}s^2_{14}s^2_{25}\sin^2 x_{54} \\ &\quad +2c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\left(s^2_{14} - s^2_{25}\right)\left(s^2_{14}\sin^2 x_{41} - s^2_{25}\sin^2 x_{51}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

when $x_{41} \simeq x_{42}$, $x_{51} \simeq x_{52}$. In Eqs. (7) and (8), the terms $O(s^4_{14})$, $O(s^4_{25})$ and $O(s^2_{14}s^2_{25})$ are neglected.

>From Eqs. (7) and (8) as well as (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_e \to \nu_e)_{\rm sol} &\simeq 1 - 4c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\left(1-s^2_{14}-s^2_{25}\right)\sin^2(x_{21})_{\rm sol}-2\left(c^2_{12}s^2_{14} + s^2_{12}s^2_{25}\right) \\ &= \left(1-s^2_{14}-s^2_{25}\right)\left[1-4c^2_{12}s^2_{12}\sin^2(x_{21})_{\rm sol}\right]-\left(c^2_{12} - s^2_{12}\right)\left(s^2_{14}-s^2_{25}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

when $x_{21} \ll x_{41} < x_{51}$ with $(x_{21})_{\rm sol} = O(\pi/2)$ or

$$P(\bar\nu_e \to \bar\nu_e)_{\rm Chooz} \simeq 1 - 2\left(c^2_{12}s^2_{14} + s^2_{12}s^2_{25}\right) \sim 1 \text{ (experimentally)} \tag{11}$$

when $x_{21} \ll x_{41} < x_{51}$ with $(x_{31})_{\rm Chooz} \simeq (x_{31})_{\rm atm} = O(\pi/2)$, and

$$P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu)_{\rm atm} \simeq \left(1 - s^2_{12}s^2_{14} - c^2_{12}s^2_{25}\right)\left[1 - \sin^2(x_{32})_{\rm atm}\right] \tag{12}$$

when $x_{21} \ll x_{31} \ll x_{41} < x_{51}$ with $(x_{31})_{\rm atm} = O(\pi/2)$, as well as

$$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm LSND} \simeq 2c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2 \left[s_{14}^2 s_{25}^2 \sin^2(x_{54})_{\rm LSND} + \frac{1}{2}\left(s_{14}^2 - s_{25}^2\right)^2 \right] \tag{13}$$

when $x_{21} \ll x_{54} \ll x_{41} < x_{51}$ with $(x_{54})_{\rm LSND} = O(\pi/2)$. In the symmetric case of $s_{14}^2 \simeq s_{25}^2$, Eq. (13) reads

$$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm LSND} \simeq 2c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2 s_{14}^4 \sin^2(x_{54})_{\rm LSND}\,. \tag{14}$$

If the nonzero LSND effect exists in the order $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm LSND} \sim (10^{-2}$ to $10^{-3})$ $\times \sin^2(x_{54})_{\rm LSND}$, the formula (14) valid in the case of $s_{14}^2 \simeq s_{25}^2$ gives

$$s_{14}^2 \sim \left(\frac{10^{-2} \text{ to } 10^{-3}}{2c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2}\right)^{1/2} \sim 0.15 \text{ to } 0.049\,, \tag{15}$$

where $2c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2 \sim 0.42$ $(s_{12}^2 \sim 0.30)$. Then, in the case of $s_{12}^2 \simeq s_{25}^2$

$$P(\nu_e \to \nu_e)_{\rm sol} \sim [1 - (0.31 \text{ to } 0.098)][1 - 0.84 \sin^2(x_{21})_{\rm sol}] \tag{16}$$

or

$$P(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm Chooz} \sim 1 - (0.31 \text{ to } 0.098) \sim 1 \text{ (experimentally)}\,, \tag{17}$$

and

$$P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu)_{\rm atm} \sim [1 - (0.15 \text{ to } 0.049)][1 - \sin^2(x_{32})_{\rm atm}]\,. \tag{18}$$

Here, $\Delta m_{54}^2 \equiv \Delta m_{\rm LSND}^2 \sim 1$ eV^2 (say).

We can see that, in particular, the nonzero LSND effect of the order $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e) \sim 10^{-2} \sin^2(x_{54})_{\rm LSND}$ would imply an experimentally visible Chooz effect $P(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e) \sim 1 - 0.31 < 1$, which is not observed. If its order was $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e) \sim 10^{-3} \sin^2(x_{54})_{\rm LSND}$ the corresponding Chooz effect, $P(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e) \sim 1 - 0.098 \sim 1$, would be nearly at the (Chooz) experimental edge (here, still $s_{13} = 0$).

In order to pass to the simplest 3+1 neutrino model [8], we can put $s_{25} \to 0$ and $(x_{41})_{\rm LSND} = O(\pi/2)$, what gives

$$P(\nu_e \to \nu_e)_{\rm sol} \simeq (1 - s_{14}^2)\left[1 - 4c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2 \sin^2(x_{21})_{\rm sol}\right] - (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) s_{14}^2 \tag{19}$$

or

$$P(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm Chooz} \simeq 1 - 2c^2_{12}s^2_{14} \sim 1 \;(\text{experimentally})\,, \tag{20}$$

and

$$P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu)_{\rm atm} \simeq (1 - s^2_{12}s^2_{14})\left[1 - \sin^2(x_{32})_{\rm atm}\right]\,, \tag{21}$$

as well as

$$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm LSND} \simeq 2c^2_{12}s^2_{12}s^4_{14}\sin^2(x_{41})_{\rm LSND} \tag{22}$$

(in Eqs (19), (20) and (21) the terms $O(s^4_{14})$ are neglected). Then, as before, $s^2_{14} \sim 0.15$ to 0.049 for the nonzero LSND effect with the amplitude of the order $O(10^{-2}$ to $10^{-3})$. Here, $\Delta m^2_{41} \equiv \Delta m^2_{\rm LSND} \sim 1$ eV^2 (say). Thus, the LSND effect is here the same as in our simplest 3+2 neutrino model with $s^2_{14} \simeq s^2_{25}$ and $(x_{54})_{\rm LSND} = O(\pi/2)$. But there, $\Delta m^2_{54} \equiv \Delta m^2_{\rm LSND} \sim 1$ eV^2 (say). In both cases, the present (pre-MiniBooNE) data do not exclude a small LSND effect with the amplitude of the order $O(10^{-3})$.

References

[1] For a review *cf.* S. Pascoli, S.T. Petcov and T. Schwetz, `hep-ph/0505226`.

[2] M. Apollonio *et al.* (Chooz Collaboration), *Eur. Phys. J.* **C 27**, 331 (2003).

[3] C. Athanassopoulos *et al.* (LSND Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3082 (1996); *Phys. Rev.* **C 58**, 2489 (1998); A. Aguilar *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 64**, 112007 (2001).

[4] A.O. Bazarko *et al.* (MiniBooNE Collaboration), `hep-ex/9906003`.

[5] *Cf. e.g.* M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, M.A. Tortola and J.W. Valle, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 643**, 321 (2002).

[6] M. Sorel, J. Conrad and M. Shaevitz, `hep-ph/0305255`.

[7] W. Królikowski, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 35**, 1675 (2004) [`hep-ph/0402183`].

[8] Ref. [7], Appendix A.

[9] W. Królikowski, in *Proc. of the 12th Max Born Symposium, Wrocław, Poland, 1998*, eds. A. Borowiec *et al.*, Springer, 2000 [`hep-ph/9808307`]; *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 30**, 227 (1999) [`hep-ph/9808207`], Appendix; *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 31**, 1913 (2000) [`hep-ph/0004222`]; *cf.* also *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 32**, 2961 (2001) [`hep-ph/0108157`]; *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 33**, 2559 (2002) [`hep-ph/0203107`]; `hep-ph/0504256`.